



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/815,639	04/02/2004	Kia Silverbrook	HYC011US	9562
24011	7590	04/21/2006	EXAMINER	
SILVERBROOK RESEARCH PTY LTD 393 DARLING STREET BALMAIN, NSW 2041 AUSTRALIA			LE, THIEN MINH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2876	

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/815,639	SILVERBROOK ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Thien M. Le	2876

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-52 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 02 April 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

The information disclosure statements filed on 10/7/2004 and 10/18/2004 have been entered.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-52 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the claims of copending Application No. U.S. Patent No. 10/815,630 (herein after referred to as 'the '630 application'). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they essentially recite the same limitations.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim 1 is rejected in view of claim 44 of the '630 application in that it recites:

A method according to claim 1, for validating entry to a competition via interaction of a sensing device with a printed competition entry form comprising coded data indicative of a unique product identifier, the method comprising the steps, performed in the computer system, of:

receiving, from the sensing device, the product identifier and interaction data representing interaction of the sensing device with the coded data, the interaction data including at least the unique product identifier and enabling a competition entry to be electronically captured in the computer system; and

transmitting the product identifier and the competition entry to a competition administrator for validation of the competition entry at the competition administrator by verification of the product identifier.

Though the claim languages are not identical, claim 44 of the '630 recites the same limitations.

Similarly,

Claim 31 is rejected in view of claims 1 and 2 of the '630 application in that they recite:

1. A method of enabling anonymous entry to a competition via a printed competition entry form that includes machine-readable coded data, the method including the steps, performed in a computer system, of:

receiving interaction data representing interaction of a sensing device with the coded data, the interaction data enabling the competition entry to be electronically captured in the computer system;

assigning a competition alias ID to the competition entry; and

transmitting the competition entry to a competition administrator with the competition alias ID, thereby enabling the anonymous entry to the competition.

2. The method of claim 1, wherein the form is disposed on a product label including human-readable information relating to the competition, and

Art Unit: 2876

the coded data is indicative of at least an identity of the label, wherein the interaction data includes at least the identity of the label.

As can be seen, claims 1 and 2 of the '630 essentially reciting the same limitations of claim 31.

Similarly,

Claim 2 is rejected in view of claim 44 and claim 2 of the '630 application.

Claim 3 is rejected in view of claim 44 and claim 5 of the '630 application.

Claim 4 is rejected in view of claim 44 and claim 7 of the '630 application.

Claim 5 is rejected in view of claim 44 and claim 13 of the '630 application.

Regarding claims 6-30 and 32-52, the limitations of these claims are merely the various combinations of the limitations recited in the claimed invention of the '630 application.

Claims 1-52 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the claims of copending Application No. U.S. Patent No. 10/815,612 (herein after referred to as 'the '612 application'). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they essentially recite the same limitations..

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim 1 is rejected in view of claim 44 of the '612 application in that it recites:

45. A method according to claim 1, for validating entry to a competition via interaction of a sensing device with a printed competition

Art Unit: 2876

entry form comprising coded data indicative of a unique product identifier, the method comprising the steps, performed in the computer system, of:

receiving, from the sensing device, the product identifier and interaction data representing interaction of the sensing device with the coded data, the interaction data including at least the unique product identifier and enabling a competition entry to be electronically captured in the computer system; and

transmitting the product identifier and the competition entry to a competition administrator for validation of the competition entry at the competition administrator by verification of the product identifier.

Though the claim languages are not identical, claim 44 of the '612 recites the same limitations.

Claim 31 is rejected in view of claims 1 and 2 of the '612 application in that they recite:

1. A product label for enabling entry to a competition, the product label comprising:

machine-readable coded data indicative of at least an identity of the label, said machine-readable coded data being readable by a sensing device as the sensing device is moved across the product label, thereby to produce interaction data for enabling the competition entry;

human-readable information pertaining to the competition, the human-readable information being at least partially coincident with the machine-readable coded data, the human-readable information including at least one field element that has a corresponding zone defined in relation to it in a page description stored in a remote computer system.

2. The product label of claim 1, wherein the at least one field element includes at least one information field.

Similarly, claims 1-30 and 32-52 are rejected in view of the claims of the '612 application since they are reciting various combinations of the claimed invention of the '612 application.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2876

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to T T. T whose telephone number is 571-217-2111. The examiner can normally be reached on 571-272-2111.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, T T. T can be reached on 571-272-1111. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



**Le, Thien Minh
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2876
April 13, 2006**